

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 15 and 22 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 15-19, 21-26 and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuji, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,522,347) and Vouri et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,767,834) in view of Barnaby et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,303) and Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,445). Applicants have removed the recitation of “automatically” changing display modes from claims 1, 15, and 22, although Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s objection as new matter because Applicants submit that the use of a display logic in a computer environment is in itself a type of automation. Therefore, the recitation of automatically should not be objected to as new matter. Applicants have removed the recitation of “automatically” as the claims have been narrowed in other ways.

With regard to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 has been amended to recite “a random access memory being partially allocated as a frame buffer, the random access memory being a unified memory.” Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 has been amended to recite “the display logic is configured to change the display mode and the size of the frame buffer during operation of an application running on the computing device according to changing graphical needs of the application, available unified memory space, and available power.” Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references alone, or in any proper combination which have been applied by the Examiner disclose, teach, or suggest that the

display logic is configured to change the display mode based on the graphical needs of the application, available unified memory space, and the available power of the device. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and its respective dependent claims are therefore allowable.

Similarly, with regard to independent claim 15, independent claim 15 has been amended to recite “the display logic is configured to change the display mode during the operation of an application running on the personal digital assistant according to changing graphical needs of the application, available unified memory space, and available power.” Again, none of the references alone, or in any proper combination teach the changing of the display mode based on the graphical needs of the application, the available unified memory space, and available power of the personal digital assistant. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 15 and its respective dependent claims are therefore allowable.

Also, similarly, with regard to independent claim 22, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 has been amended to recite that “the display logic being configured to automatically change the display mode during operation of an application running on the computing device according changing graphical needs of the application, available unified memory space, and available power.” Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references applied by the Examiner disclose, teach, or suggest alone, or in any proper combination, the changing of the display logic, computing device according the changing graphical needs of the application, the available unified memory space, and available power of the computing device. Accordingly, independent claim 22 and its respective dependent claims are therefore allowable.

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 15, and 22 may be found on pages 9 and 10 of the application. Accordingly, the amended claims do not contain new matter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-30 are therefore in condition for allowance.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance.
Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 20, 2004

By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5730
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,603